

The Library

Fourth Series
Vol. I. No. 1

1 June 1920

TRAVESTIES OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

By R. FARQUHARSON SHARP¹

THE sacrilegious hands of the parodist do not appear to have been laid upon Shakespeare much before the end of the eighteenth century; but between 1792 and 1808 five travesties appeared—all five, curiously enough, being from the pens of foreigners. The earliest of these is by a French author, the other four are by Germans.

We may, I think, fairly leave out of count an English travesty that appeared in the seventeenth century, inasmuch as it was a travesty of Shakespeare only at second hand. I refer to *The Mock Tempest*, by Thomas Duffett, which was a parody of Dryden and Davenant's perversion of *The Tempest*. *The Mock Tempest* was published in 1675, and a few years later Sir William Soames wrote of it:

'The dullest scribblers some admirers found
And the Mock Tempest was a while renown'd,
But this low stuff the town at last despised
And scorned the folly that they once had prized.'

Exclusive of that, I have been able to trace some 59 travesties, produced between 1792 and 1895. I do not suppose that my list is exhaustive, but it is as complete as I have been able to make it. The Shakespeare bibliographies have none

¹ Read before the Bibliographical Society, 17 November 1919.

of them anything like a complete list of travesties in their 'Shakespeareana' sections. Out of those I have traced there are about half a dozen that I have not been able to see. Of these, four are in the Barton Shakespeare collection in the Public Library at Boston, Mass. Of the rest, there are six or seven that are not in the British Museum Library nor (as far as I have been able to ascertain) in any London library. There are copies of these, however, at the Birmingham Public Library; and through the kindness of Mr. Powell, the Birmingham librarian, I have been able to see them. Where I have not mentioned the whereabouts of any particular travesty, it may be assumed that there is a copy at the British Museum.

Of the 59 that I have traced there are only seven that do not appear to have been published. (I have not taken into account parodies of isolated scenes or speeches from Shakespeare's plays.)

It is interesting to note which have been the favourite plays for travesty. *Hamlet* is an easy first, with eighteen out of my 59 to its score. *Othello* comes next, with eight; *Romeo and Juliet* with seven; *Richard III* with six; *The Merchant of Venice* and *Macbeth* with four apiece; *Antony and Cleopatra* with three; *The Tempest*, *Coriolanus*, and *King Lear* with two apiece; and *King John*, *A Winter's Tale*, and *The Taming of the Shrew* with one each.

It cannot be claimed that any high level of wit is attained in these travesties, except in one or two cases—notably in one of the very latest—but of that it will perhaps be possible to form some judgement from such brief excerpts and descriptions as I shall be able to give.

Instead of grouping together the various travesties written on the same play, it will be more interesting to consider them in their chronological sequence, as that may in some degree indicate the changing fashion in humour.

To begin, then, with the five foreigners that head my list: a travesty of *Othello*, called *Arlequin Cruello*, was played and published (anonymously) in Paris in 1792; one of *Hamlet*, entitled *Der travestirte Hamlet*, was played and published in Vienna in 1798; another of *Hamlet*, called *Prinz Hamlet von Dänemark*, was published in Berlin in 1799; one of *Othello* appeared in Vienna in 1806, and one of *Romeo and Juliet* in the same city in 1808.

The anonymous *Arlequin Cruello* calls itself a 'parodie d'*Othello*', but is really more of the nature of a mildly amusing little vaudeville with a plot faintly resembling that of *Othello*. The characters are members of a troupe of actors in which Cruello plays the Harlequin parts, Doucelmone the ingénues, her father the parts of the 'père noble', and so forth. Doucelmone is betrothed to Cruello; but her affections are alienated by the black mask he wears, and she philanders with the son of the 'Directeur', a youth who plays secondary lovers' parts. Cruello attacks Doucelmone in fury; but the vaudeville ends, as it should, with her resuscitation and with satisfactory explanations all round. Slight as the piece is, it required (according to Barbier) three authors to concoct it—Jean-Baptiste Radet, François Georges Fouques, and Pierre Barré.

After this follow, close on each other's heels, the four German travesties. *Der travestirte Hamlet* (Vienna, 1798) is a ponderous vaudeville which has but little reference to the original it professes to burlesque. It is stated to be by 'Karl Ludwig Gieseke', which was a pseudonym used by Johann Georg Metzler.

Its successor, *Prinz Hamlet von Dänemark*, published anonymously in Berlin in 1799, was the work of Johann Friedrich Schink. This is nearly as dull a work as its predecessor and is three times as long. It has the merit, however, that its plot follows the lines of the original to a considerable

extent. Hamlet is represented as having written his play for the Players to perform and as being tortured with indecision as to whether he shall allow it to be printed or not. I will endeavour to translate a few lines :

' To print or not to print, that is the question !
Whether 'twere better that my masterpiece
Should in my desk lie buried, or be sent,
As well corrected copy, to the printers,
And so end all ? A little risk, no more,
And by that risk to end my daily headaches,'—

and so on. The burlesque is full of what are obviously allusions to contemporary characters and events, and without a key to these one is in the dark as to the quality of wit that is being displayed. Indeed, on looking through it I was irresistibly reminded of a criticism of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* that was told to me as coming from the mouth of an actor's 'dresser' who had been witnessing that play for the first time. On being asked what he thought of it, he replied : ' Well, sir, it may have been funny when it was written, but it isn't now.'

Our fourth and fifth foreign travesties, *Othello der Mohr in Wien* (Vienna, 1806) and *Romeo und Julie, ein Quodlibet mit Gesang* (Vienna, 1808), are, like the others, vaudevilles, but have the merit of being shorter. The fun in both seems to consist in the modernizing of Shakespeare's characters and making them talk in Viennese dialect.

It is something of a relief to turn to English travesties, which from this date begin to appear in fair numbers. The earliest, *Hamlet Travestie*, by John Poole (the author of *Paul Pry*), was first published in 1810 and had a remarkable success, going through six editions in seven years. It was last reprinted in 1853. Poole prefaced the original edition with an 'apologia', anticipating the charge of sacrilege or at least levity ; but by the time he had reached his fourth

edition he was bold enough to print an 'advertisement' expressing his gratification at the 'liberality and good-humour' with which his work had been received, and 'congratulating those who, on its first appearance, were apprehensive for the reputation of Shakespeare that, notwithstanding Three Editions are already before the public, he is neither expelled from our libraries nor banished from our stage'.

The travesty was performed at Covent Garden in 1813, with Charles Mathews the elder as Hamlet and Liston as Ophelia, and it was twice revived in the seventies to give two actors the opportunity of imitating Irving's Hamlet. The dialogue is not brilliantly funny, but probably Poole's audiences and readers had not the sophistication which comes of familiarity with burlesque. Shakespeare's plot is followed pretty closely, except that Hamlet and Laertes 'put on the gloves' for the final fight. The soliloquies are all turned into songs, to be sung to the tunes of popular songs of the day. For example, Hamlet sings (to the tune of 'Here we go up, up, up'):

When a man becomes tir'd of his life,
The question is, to be or not to be ?
For before he dare finish the strife
His reflections most serious ought to be.
When his troubles too numerous grow
And he knows of no method to mend them,
Had he best bear them tamely, or no ?
Or by stoutly opposing them end them ?
(Refrain.) Ri tol de rol, &c.'

As a fair specimen of the dialogue, let me quote a few lines from the opening scene :

'*Queen.* Come, Hamlet, leave off crying ; 'tis in vain,
Since crying will not bring him back again.
Besides, 'tis common : all that lives must die.
So blow your nose, my dear, and do not cry.

Hamlet. Aye, madam, it is common.

Queen.

If it be,

Why seems there such a mighty fuss with thee ?

Hamlet. Talk not to me of seems ; when husbands die,

'Twere well if some folks seemed the same as I.

But I have that within you can't take from me—

As for black clothes, that 's all my eye and Tommy.'

The best fun of the travesty lies in the 'burlesque annotations, after the manner of Dr. Johnson, George Steevens, Esq., and the various commentators', which Poole appends to his text. In his preface he says that while apology may be deemed necessary for parodying the poet, he does not propose to offer any for parodying what he styles 'the perversion of 'sense, the obscuration of meaning, the false lights, the fanciful 'and arbitrary illustrations, of Black-letter Critics and Coney-catching Commentators'. To give an instance of the annotations: his appendix includes notes after the manner of Warburton, Johnson, and Steevens upon the phrase 'That 's all my eye and Tommy' in the passage I have just quoted. Warburton is made to suspect that in place of 'my eye and Tommy' the author wrote 'my own to me'; so that (with the trifling alteration of 'within' to 'without') the lines would run:

'But I have that without you can't take from me,

As my black clothes are all my own to me,—

'i.e. my own personal property—not borrowed from the 'royal wardrobe, but made expressly for me at my own 'expense.'

On this emendation Johnson is made to comment as follows: 'Here is an elaborate display of ingenuity without 'accuracy. He that will wantonly sacrifice the sense of his 'author to a supererogatory refinement may gain the admiration of the unlearned and excite the wonder of the ignorant ; 'but of obtaining the praise of the illuminated, and the

'approbation of the erudite, let him despair. "My eye and "Tommy" (i. e. "fudge") is the true reading; and' the 'passage, as it stands, is correct.'

Steevens is made to follow with the brief remark: 'In the *Ryght Tragical Hystorie of Master Thomas Thumbe*, bl. letter, no date, I find, "'Tis all my eye and Betty Martin," used in the same sense. If the substitution of "Tommy" for "Betty Martin" be allowed, Dr. Johnson's explanation 'is just.'

Poole having parodied Shakespeare and lived, not only to tell the tale but to see his play pass through several editions, his example was speedily followed. Two years after his *Hamlet Travestie* first saw the light, a travesty of *Romeo and Juliet* appeared, and in 1813 travesties of *Macbeth* and *Othello*. These were by three separate authors; but each author, in his preface, cites Poole as a precedent for his audacity, and each copies Poole in adding burlesque annotations after the styles of well-known Shakespearian commentators. In no case, however, are these notes as witty as Poole's.

The *Romeo and Juliet* travesty (1812) was by a Richard Gurney. In his preface, besides making the stock apology to which I have alluded, he adds: 'I have also taken the liberty 'of omitting in the present work all the indelicate passages of 'the original . . . for surely it is neither the province of true 'gallantry nor wit, be the vices of the age what they may, to 'shock the feelings of our fair countrywomen by indecent 'bagatelles and doubles entendres.' The plot of his travesty follows that of Shakespeare, save that Juliet ends her life, in the tomb scene, by banging her head with a couple of thigh-bones of her ancestors. Everybody blames the Friar for all that has happened, and the few survivors at the end of the play determine to try him at the next Assizes.

The *Macbeth Travestie* appeared in the following year

(1813) in the anonymously published *Accepted Addresses*. It is a dreary production—the soliloquies, as usual, being turned into songs to be sung to popular tunes.

The *Othello* travesty, also published in 1813, if not particularly witty or refined, is at any rate livelier. The author, who remains anonymous but signs his preface 'Ibef', says therein: 'In the present rage for Hippo-Dramas and whilst the formation of theatres remains so ill-judged as it is, no play of merit can be performed to the satisfaction of a delicately accurate and discerning mind. To travestie works, therefore, which can alone be duly appreciated by private and patient perusal, cannot be deemed very culpable. The motions of the Heavenly Bodies have not been ridiculed into insignificance by the poor imitation of an Orrery.' 'Hippo-Dramas' were in high favour at this time, at Astley's Amphitheatre and the Olympic. When Elliston took over the management of the latter in 1814, he found it arranged as a circus and had to remodel the building. In the last scene of this *Othello* travesty, Desdemona is discovered asleep in a sofa bed, the lid of which can be shut down. Othello gives her a smacking, and then disposes of her by shutting down the lid of the bed, to the accompaniment of the melody 'I've locked up all my treasure'.

Meanwhile, in 1811, a German travesty of *Coriolanus*, by Julius von Voss, had been published at Berlin in a book of *Travestien und Burlesken*. This is quite a slight affair, in one act, written in rhymed couplets and not particularly amusing. It is, however, a play and not a vaudeville.

Three travesties on the subject of *Richard III*, all published in London, come next in chronological order. One is a '*King Richard III Travestie*, by William By' (1816), of which a copy is at Boston. The second is a '*Richard III Travestie*, with annotations by Contract Jumble' (1823); a copy of this is at Birmingham. The third, which was

published anonymously in 1823, has the inevitable preface of apology quoting Poole as precedent. There is a point of interest in it in the author's allusion to the 'great success Mr. Poole's Hamlet met with in the closet and its total failure upon the stage'. This, the author thinks, was because Poole's travesty was too long; so, to avoid a similar error, he compresses his travesty into two acts. For all that, they are two acts too long; for his work is very poor stuff and by no means up to even Poole's modest level.

Out of six travesties produced between 1830 and 1840, there are two that I have not been able to see. These are '*King Lear and his daughters queer*, by Hugo Vamp' (London, 1830), a copy of which is at Boston, and an anonymous '*Hamlet, a new burlesque*' (London, 1838). I have not been able to trace the whereabouts of a copy of the latter, but Jaggard mentions it as having been published.

Of the other four, one is '*Macbeth Modernized; a most illegitimate drama*, by Robert Bell' (1838). It was privately printed, and a copy of it is at Birmingham. It is in the customary vaudeville form, and is rather silly. In the murder scene the heads of Duncan and Banquo are seen peeping from their hiding-place behind a bed in which they have arranged a pig in the bedclothes to represent the sleeping King. Macbeth stabs this, with gory result. Of the remaining three, one (to which I shall refer directly) is by Gilbert A'Beckett, and two, which were published in 1834 and 1837 respectively, are from the pen of a certain Maurice G. Dowling. They are a 'burlesque burletta' on *Othello* and a travesty of *Romeo and Juliet*. Both are dull and vulgar. *Othello* is described as being 'an independent nigger from the Republic of Hayti' and talks Christy Minstrel dialogue. His address to the Senate, which begins:

'Potent, grave and rev'rend sir,
Very noble massa,'

is directed to be sung to the tune of 'Yankee Doodle'. Dowling's *Romeo and Juliet* is of the same kidney, and need not detain us.

Gilbert A'Beckett's burlesque, on *King John*, was produced in 1837; and, with his name and those of Francis Talfourd, the brothers Brough and Charles Selby, we get back into a less illiterate stratum. *King John* is not a very promising subject for parody, but A'Beckett made the most of it according to the burlesque fashion of the day. In the scene between Hubert and Prince Arthur, Hubert (who is Dentist to the Court) threatens to pull out the boy's teeth with a huge pair of pincers, while the 'Ruffian' stands by 'with pewter basin, towel, &c.'; the 'Ruffian' being described in the cast of characters as 'attached to Hubert, but a member of the Animals' Friend Society'.

I find record of the publication of a '*Macbeth Travestie*, by A. K. Northall' in New York in 1843 (a copy is at Boston); and of a '*Coriolanus Travestie*, by James Morgan,' published at Liverpool in 1846—'apparently the first Liverpool Shakespearean publication, and rather unworthy of the occasion,' says Jaggard; but I have not been able to see either of these. A '*Hamlet Travestie*, by C. Beckington,' was published in Newcastle in 1847 (a copy is at Birmingham). This follows the same lines as Poole's travesty, but without any perceptible improvement on it; it also includes a number of passages bodily 'lifted' from Poole, due acknowledgement of this being made in the preface.

The year 1844 had seen the production of two more travesties of *Richard III*, one by Charles Selby and one by Joseph Sterling Coyne. The latter's effort is described by a contemporary critic in the *Era* as 'a burlesque to which, 'but for an exquisite imitation of an actor who is ungifted 'with any pre-eminent talent for tragedy, we could scarcely 'have accorded a moment's tolerance'. The actor referred

to must, I think, be Phelps, who had in that year begun his venture at Sadler's Wells.

In 1848 the brothers Brough wrote (for the Adelphi theatre) a burlesque of *The Tempest* under the title of *The Enchanted Isle; or, Raising the Wind on the most approved principles*.

At the close of the forties and the beginning of the fifties Francis Talfourd was turning out a number of farces and burlesques. Among the latter was a *Macbeth Travestie* published at Oxford in 1850 and stated on its title-page to be 'as performed at Henley on the day of the Regatta, 17 June 1847'. Five or six years later it was played at the Olympic, with Robson in the title-part. Talfourd was also responsible for a *Hamlet* travesty published at Oxford in 1849, and for two travesties on *The Merchant of Venice*, a play which till then had escaped the parodist. Of these two, the earlier was published at Oxford in 1849, but apparently not performed. Four years later Talfourd expanded it, and it was played at the Olympic in July 1853 with Robson as Shylock. This part is said to have given Robson the first chance of exhibiting fully the tragi-comic power which was the characteristic of his acting, and the burlesque drew the town. Talfourd called it '*Shylock, or the Merchant of Venice preserved*'. An entirely new reading from an edition hitherto undiscovered . . . which it is hoped may be received as the stray leaves of a Jerusalem hearty-joke.' I am bound to say that a perusal of it has left me with the conviction that Robson must have been an even greater genius than he is reputed. Talfourd had, however, a thorough knowledge of the theatre, and I have little doubt that much of the burlesque would act far better than it reads. Some of the lines are fairly neatly turned. For instance:

'How like a swindling publican he looks,
Applying for his licence when the books

Travesties of Shakespeare's Plays

Are crowded with complaint of open house
At two o'clock A.M. and drunken rows !

I hate him as a conscientious nuisance

Who brings down our Venetian rate of usance.'

Talfourd's dialogue reflects the fondness for the pun which was characteristic of the burlesque humour of the day (and for a couple of decades later) and was developed to its utmost by such writers as Burnand and H. J. Byron. In this travesty, for instance, Portia says :

'But mind, Nerissa, that a maiden should

Of kisses to a bearded man be chary,'—

to which Nerissa replies :

'Such a salute, ma'am, must be salute-hairy.'

It is very easy to sneer at the pun as a form of humour ; but the fact remains that it was the basis of burlesque fun for thirty years or more, and seemed to afford unrestricted enjoyment to audiences until its supremacy was challenged by the finer humour of Sir W. S. Gilbert. And, after all, Shakespeare himself had not disdained to use it.

To resume our chronicle, no more than passing reference need be made to an 'Ethiopian burlesque' of *Hamlet*, as performed by Griffin and Christy's Minstrels in 1849 and subsequently ; to a *Hamlet* travesty by George Edward Rice, published anonymously in Boston in 1852 (a copy is at Birmingham) ; to a *King Lear* travesty published and played in London in 1855 as *King Queer and his daughters three* ; or to an *Othello* travesty, *A Moor and an Amour*, published at Liverpool in 1856.

A travesty of some interest, that was produced and published in 1856, is William Brough's *Perdita, or the Royal Milkmaid*, a burlesque of *A Winter's Tale*. This was played by a cast that included Miss Marie Wilton (now Lady Bancroft) as *Perdita*, this being one of her earliest appearances in London, and, as *Autolycus*, a rising young actor of the name

of J. L. Toole. In the list of scenes, the second is said to be 'a desert spot on the shores of Bohemia, or Bithynia, or wherever it is'; and, at the end of the Prologue, Time (who is speaking as Chorus) breaks into a song, to the air of 'The Rat-Catcher's Daughter', with the words:

'Long time ago from Bohemia
Sailed the King—no, we're wrong about the quarter,
For the King didn't come from Bohemia
'Cause he couldn't come thence by water;
So we can't have that, but we'll place him at
Bithynia—it's a name no shorter.'

This was a hit at Charles Kean's production of *A Winter's Tale* at the Princess's in the same year. Charles Kean's bid for fame was frankly made as what we should nowadays call a 'producer' of plays, for he was not a particularly good actor. He was a Shakespearian enthusiast, mainly from the commentator's standpoint; and he was a fervent archaeologist, very proud of his designation as 'Charles Kean, F.S.A.'. In his mounting of Shakespeare's plays at the Princess's, authorities of all kinds were ransacked to ensure a faithful reproduction of what were often entirely unessential details in elaborating the pictures of past days. With the production of each play he issued a 'descriptive leaflet'; and in the case of *A Winter's Tale* he boggled at Bohemia as possessing no sea-coast and transformed it into Bithynia,—gravely stating in his descriptive leaflet that, amongst other accuracies, his scenes included 'vegetation peculiar to Bithynia, from private drawings taken on the spot'.

There now turns up unexpectedly in our chronological list an Italian travesty of *Othello* by Andrea Codebò, published at Milan in 1858. The author calls it a 'parodia tragica', and it certainly is not very mirth-provoking. One of the few humorous ideas in it is that of making Othello press snuff upon Cassio, so as to oblige him to blow his nose and

consequently display the handkerchief which Desdemona is supposed to have given him.

The next year (1859) saw the production, at the Strand theatre, of Andrew Halliday's *Romeo and Juliet Travestie ; or, The Cup of Cold Poison*. In this Juliet, instead of drinking a potion, is sent to sleep by a perusal of the latest work of Mr. Martin Tupper. In the scene with the Friar, she is made to say :

'Rather than marry Paris, I would drink
South Afric sherry—and I really think
I would invest of all my wealth the half
In shares of the Atlantic Telegraph ;
I'd leave off crinoline—neglect my supper—
I'd even read a work by Mr. Tupper.'

Whereupon the Friar gives her Mr. Tupper's latest work, with the words :

'It is his latest work. When on page you look,
A cold and drowsy humour soon will creep
Over your sense—as more you read, a sleep
Will overtake you, and your pulse will cease.'

The travesty ends, as usual, with the resuscitation of the various corpses, who break into song and dance.

Two *Hamlet* travesties appeared in London at the end of the sixties : *Hamlet the ravin' prince of Denmark ; or, The Baltic Swell and the Diving Belle* (1866), and '*A Throw for a Throne ; or, the Prince Unmasked*. By Sergeant Zinn' (1870). A copy of the former of these is at Birmingham, and one of the latter at Boston. The former is stated on the title-page to have been 'printed for private representation'—which seems just as well, for it is poor stuff. Here, again, passages are stolen verbatim from Poole, whom the author presumably thought to be quite forgotten, for he makes no acknowledgement of his dishonesty. In it, as in Poole, Hamlet and Laertes 'put on the gloves' for the final fight—

'the Danish Chicken' versus 'King Claudius's big 'un'—and the Ghost in this case is 'kindly lent by Mr. Pepper'.

A *Romeo and Juliet* travesty was published at Oxford in 1868, but I have not been able to see it.

The most prolific and popular burlesque writer about this time was Burnand, and his work included several Shakespearian travesties. He wrote two of *Antony and Cleopatra*, one for the Haymarket in 1866 and one for the Gaiety in 1873; one of *Richard III* for the Royalty in 1868; and one of *The Tempest* which was played at the Gaiety in 1883 under the title of *Ariel*. By the later eighties punning humour was passing out of fashion on the stage, but Burnand resolutely and successfully worked the vein for all it was worth. A fair example may be taken from the wooing scene in his *Rise and Fall of Richard III*:

Richard. I see that you a passion for me foster—

Anne. Passion for you! High, mighty, double Glo'ster!

Richard. Oh, call me double Glo'ster if you please,
As long as I, in your eyes, am the cheese.

Anne. A cheese! Why, then I'll cut you.

Richard. I've the daring
To ask you to consider this cheese-pairing.'

Hamlet the Hysterical; a delirium in five spasms, was played at the Princess's in 1874. This was inspired by Irving's performance of Hamlet, which was first seen in that year. It does not appear to have been published. Two stupid travesties, one on *Romeo and Juliet* and one on *Hamlet*, were published in 1877 and 1879 respectively in St. Louis, U.S.A., by Charles C. Soule. They were written for representation before the St. Louis University Club, and they bear all the marks of that intention. The tale of Shakespearian travesties in the seventies is concluded by a *Hamlet à la Mode*, by G. L. Gordon and G. W. Anson, produced at Liverpool in 1877, but, apparently, not published.

Between 1880 and the end of the nineties, eleven travesties appeared in English, one in German, and one in Danish, and after that the practice seems to have died its natural death. Of the English eleven, two were of *The Merchant of Venice*—the one an American travesty published in 1884 for amateur use, and the other a burlesque by F. J. Fraser entitled *The Merry Merchant of Venice: a peep at Shakespeare through the Venetians*, which was published at Allahabad in 1895 and was obviously written for performance before military audiences.

Burnand's *Tempest* travesty of 1883 has been already mentioned; a German *Othello: Parodie von Caprice* was published at Budapest in 1885; and in 1888 John Kendrick Bangs published in New York a travesty of *The Taming of the Shrew*, which is a re-writing of that play in such fashion that Katherine successfully gets the upper hand of Petruchio and proclaims the lesson that the modern shrew is to be tamed, if tamed at all, by different methods.

A travesty of *Antony and Cleopatra*, by W. Sapte, was played at the Avenue theatre in 1891, but apparently not published; and in the same year there was published in Edinburgh '*Rummio and Judy*, by Horace Amelius Lloyd'. A copy of the latter is at Birmingham. Its level of refinement may be gauged by a stage direction at the close of the potion scene after 'Judy' has sat down to a jorum of milk punch which she has brewed. The stage-direction runs: 'Drinks' and becomes progressively intoxicated. Music expressive of 'getting drunk. She is at last so overcome that she staggers' to her bed and falls on it. Pause.'

In 1895 a Danish travesty, *Othello i Provindsen*, was published at Copenhagen. It is a comedy of bourgeois life, more or less on the lines of Shakespeare's play.

The remaining five English travesties in this last period were all of *Hamlet*. '*Hamlet Improved*, by G. H. Colomb' (London, 1880), states in its preface that it is 'not designed to

'burlesque Shakespeare; on the contrary, it is intended as 'a satire upon those who, with Voltaire, consider the great 'dramatist's genius over-rated'. A good deal of it is taken up with a discussion between 'Mr. Mendall, a brilliant dramatic author' and 'Mr. Makeall, a successful theatrical manager', as to the amendment and improvement necessary to Shakespeare's plays before they will 'draw' the public. They are at all events agreed as to the absolute necessity of a farcical ending to the last act of *Hamlet*.

'*Hamlet; or, Not such a Fool as he looks*. By the author of *The Light Green*' was published at Cambridge in 1882. (A copy is at Birmingham.) This is a brief vaudeville, in which the King is trapped by a performance of Punch and Judy, the tragic parts of whose drama cause him to display so much emotion that he betrays himself.

A Fireside Hamlet, by J. Comyns Carr, and *Very Little Hamlet*, by William Yardley were both produced in London in 1884. Both of them made good-humoured fun of Wilson Barrett's performance of *Hamlet* at the Princess's in that year, but only the former was published.

Last of the *Hamlet* travesties, and by a long way the wittiest, is Sir W. S. Gilbert's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern*. This was written and first performed in 1891, and is published in the collected edition of Gilbert's plays. The plot is as follows: King Claudius, when a young man, wrote a five-act tragedy which was damned and all reference to it forbidden under penalty of death. His son Hamlet's tendency to soliloquy has so alarmed the Queen that she has sent for Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to devise some Court revels for his entertainment. Rosencrantz is a former lover of Ophelia, who has been betrothed to Hamlet, and these two lay their heads together to devise a plan by which Hamlet may be put out of the way. Rosencrantz persuades Ophelia to steal from her father's desk the one extant copy of the

King's play which her father in his capacity of Lord Chamberlain has preserved, and they offer it to Hamlet (who has never heard of it and is unaware of the penalty attached) for performance at some Court theatricals which are in preparation. It is played, with tragic result.

At the opening of the skit, the King is explaining his sadness to the Queen as being the result of memories of the fate of his drama. He tells her how, when the ill-starred work was about to be produced :

'The day approached—all Denmark stood agape.

Arrangements were devised at once by which

Seats might be booked a twelvemonth in advance.'

But, as he tells her, ten minutes of the first act were enough for the audience, and, after that, 'the curtain fell, never to rise again'. The Queen asks :

'Was it, my lord, so very very bad ?'

to which he replies :

'Not to deceive my trusting Queen, it was.'

The King, however, had taken steps to set himself right with the world. He says :

'I wrote an Act by way of epilogue—

An Act by which the penalty of death

Was meted out to all that sneered at it.

The play was not good—but the punishment

Of those that laughed at it was capital.'

When Rosencrantz arrives, meets Ophelia, and hears of her betrothal to Hamlet, he asks her what he is like. This is her reply :

'Alike for no two seasons at a time.

Sometimes he's tall—sometimes he's very short—

Now with black hair—now with a flaxen wig—

Sometimes an English accent—then a French—

Then English with a strong provincial "burr"—

Once an American, and once a Jew—

But Danish never, take him how you will !
And strange to say, whate'er his tongue may be,
Whether he 's dark or flaxen—English—French—
Though we're in Denmark, A.D. ten-six-two,
He always dresses as King James the First.'

Hamlet is pleased with the play that Rosencrantz and Ophelia offer him ; and, prior to its performance, he treats the Players to a lengthy and wordy address on the evils of buffoonery in acting. To this the First Player replies that he and his fellows 'are much beholden to the prince for his good 'counsels. But they would urge upon his consideration the 'fact that they are accomplished players, who have spent many 'years in learning their profession ; and they would venture to 'suggest that it would better befit his lordship to confine 'himself to such matters as his lordship might be likely to 'understand.'

The play is duly enacted, and its absurdities move the whole Court to paroxysms of laughter, until the King, recognizing his handiwork, exclaims that Hamlet shall die, and draws his dagger for the purpose. At Ophelia's entreaties, however, he spares Hamlet's life and banishes him to England, where possibly his peculiarities may be appreciated.

Even so brief a survey of Shakespearian travesties as the foregoing will serve to show that, as a rule, they have not risen to any very high level of wit ; nor has there been, except in some of the prose passages in Gilbert's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern*, any real attempt to parody Shakespeare's style. The parodying, in general, amounts to an irreverent transforming of serious situations into absurd ones. Be that as it may, we may perhaps consider these impertinences as having at least a place in the scheme of things inasmuch as they give to those unregenerate spirits (and such are to be found even in what the British Museum Catalogue delights to call 'Academies and Learned Societies') who are at times

a trifle weary of the earnestness of the 'earnest student' of Shakespeare, opportunity to snatch an unholy pleasure from finding the plays regarded, not as solemn ceremonials, but as plays written by a human being and a practical dramatist, and therefore fair game for the parodist.

If it be objected that there is, as I have hinted, very little real parody about the travesties, we must fall back upon the sad truth that in most cases the appeal of such things arises from their pandering to the low liking, which persists in human nature, for seeing solemn things made to look absurd. Which, as Pepys would say, is very strange.

SOME NOTES ON TWO EARLY ROMANCES—HUON
DE BORDEAUX AND MELUSINE ¹

By F. W. BOURDILLON

IT has long been common knowledge among bibliographers that there is an edition of *Huon de Bordeaux* bearing a date three years earlier than that mentioned as the first edition by Brunet; but the relation of this edition of 1513 to that of 1516 has not, as far as I know, been hitherto described. A brief account of these two editions, with a classification of all editions, may therefore be acceptable to members of the Bibliographical Society.

The two editions of 1513 and 1516 are for all ordinary purposes one and the same book; and a copy of either which had lost both title-page and colophon would require the closest scrutiny to decide to which edition it belonged. The type is the same; the woodcuts (with a single exception) the same; the page-wording and the placing of the cuts is throughout the same. In fact, it is evident that for the greater part of the book there was only one setting of the type. The points of difference are the following:

1. The title-page and the colophon.

(1513) LEs prouesses et faitz mer-/ueilleux du noble Huon de bordeaulx per de france, duc/de guyenne. Nouuellemēt redige en bon francoys & im/prime par le congie et preuilege du Roy nostre sire cōme/il appert a la fin de la table de ce present liure.

[Below: woodcut of the Plumed Horseman.]

(f. clxxxviii recto:) ¶ Cy finissent les faictz et gestes/du noble Huon de bordeaulx duc de/guyenne & per de france./

¹ Part of a paper read before the Bibliographical Society, December 1919.

Auecques/plusieurs aultres faitz & prouesses/daulcuns Princes regnans en son/temps. Nouuellemēt imprime a pa/ris par Michel le noir Libraire iure/en luniuersite de paris. Demourās/en la grant rue saint Jacques. Le-/quel a preuillege du Roy nostre sire/que nul autre que luy ne le peult im/primer ne faire imprimer autre que/luy et ses commys iusques a deux/ans finitz & accomplys a prendre du/io^r que ledict liure sera imprime qui/est le .xxvi. iour de novembre mil. v /cens et treize.

[Below : M. le Noir's device.]

(1516) LEs prouesses et faitz mer-/ueilleux du noble Huon de bordeaux per de france, duc de guy/enne. Nouuellement redige en bon francoys et imprime par le/congie et preuillege du Roy nostre sire.

[Below : woodcut of the Plumed Horseman.]

(f. clxxxviii.) ¶ Cy finissēt les faitz et gestes du/noble Huon de bordeaux duc de guy/enne et per de france. Auecques plu-/sieurs aultres faitz & prouesses daul/cuns Princes regnans en son temps/Nouuellement imprime a Paris le./xxiiii. iour de decēbre. Mil cinq cens/et seize. Pour Jehan Petit Libraire/Jure en Luniuersite de Paris. De/mourāt en la grāt rue saint Jaques.¹ ¶ Cum Preuillegio.

[Below : Petit's device.]

2. In 1513, the Table of Contents at the beginning is followed (sign. ā [vi] verso) by the 'preuillege', which occupies the whole page.

In 1516, the 'preuillege' does not appear; but its place is filled by a large woodcut of a bare-headed man on his knees presenting a volume to a king enthroned and crowned. This cut is found in other books of Michel and Philippe le Noir, e.g. the *Jardin de Plaisance*, s.d., and the *Illustrations de Gaulle*, 1524.

¹ This is according to the copy before me. In Brunet the words that follow the date are given as: par Michel le Noir.

3. In the rest of the book some fifteen leaves show perceptible points of difference. Even, however, where a page or a leaf carries some salient and unmistakable sign of new setting, as in words abbreviated or written in full, the general appearance of the page is most deceptively similar, and it is quite possible that other leaves than the fifteen I have observed may have been reset, reset to the point of facsimile. In a considerable number of cases, however, a lifted space-block, or a worn letter, or a marked irregularity of line offers sure evidence of the page being of the same impression.

All copies I have seen of the earlier of these two editions bear the name of Michel le Noir; but in the 1516 edition the name of his close ally and frequent coadjutor Jehan Petit appears in some copies instead of his own. This second edition was not issued till a full year after the expiration of the previous 'Privilège'; nor would it seem that any rival edition was even then threatening, as the next extant edition is the quarto issued by the widow of Jehan Trepperel, and must have appeared between 1522 and 1527—that is, at least six years later. I regret that I have not seen a copy of this edition, and cannot therefore give any account of it, or say what relation it bears in text or illustrations to Le Noir's.

These two Le Noir editions—for I think there is sufficient difference to justify the use of the often-abused word edition: to call them merely two issues would be rather misleading, in view of the reprinting of at least seventeen leaves and possibly more, and further in the absence of the Privilège in the second—these two editions are illustrated throughout with woodcuts altogether identical except for the additional cut taking the place of the Privilège, which makes the number in the second 88 instead of 87. There are only 14 repeats, so that there are respectively 73 and 74 separate cuts. Of these, twenty certainly, and perhaps one or two more, are special cuts designed for this work; and these are regrettably bad:

not the worst of the worst, such as the shameless atrocities found in the cheaper and later Paris Romances, but very decidedly poor work, inferior though conscientious in design, and correspondingly inferior in cutting. Yet of six of these poor things transfer-copies even worse appear in Denys Janot's later undated edition of the same Romance.

The cut on the title-page is the handsome and well-known cut of a Plumed Horseman. This fine cut appears in several of Le Noir's books, and this is not its first service; for it had been used eleven years before in the edition of *Beuves d'Antihonne* (Bevis of Hampton) published by Le Noir in 1502: I do not know of any earlier appearance.

The remaining illustrations are for the most part small cuts familiar in Le Noir's publications. They evidently belong to several different series, and all probably began life as illustrations to some particular work, to which it may some day be possible to trace them. But besides the smaller cuts there are six of larger size and more interesting. These six cuts (eleven with repeats) belong to the famous series illustrating the *Destruction de Troye le Grand* of Jacques Millet (a sort of Mystery-play in verse, founded on Colonna's Troy book), which was published at Paris by Jacques Bonhomme in 1484. Of this Troy book M. Claudin says: 'It is one of the earliest and most remarkable books printed with woodcuts at Paris, the illustrations designed by a real artist, who has given a true character of life and movement to the persons represented.' Mr. Pollard, in the Pierpont Morgan Catalogue, agrees in this appreciation of these cuts, though he thinks that more than one artist and several cutters were employed on them. There were three editions of this work issued at Paris in the fifteenth century, the second and third being published by Vêrard, into whose hands the blocks seem to have passed. After the edition of 1498 the cuts are not found again as a set, so far as I know. Whether some of them

perished with Vérard's shop on the bridge that fell the next year we cannot tell; but of the complete set of 27 cuts about half are found promiscuously in books of a later date, and at least eleven of them appear after the death of Vérard to have come into the possession or control of Le Noir, as they occur fairly frequently in books bearing his name.

The 1513 edition of *Huon de Bordeaux* is the earliest known, and is always presumed to have been the first printed. It may be pointed out, however, that the colophon states it to be 'nouvellement imprimé', words which usually imply a previous edition; and further that 1513 is a late date for the first appearance in print of such an important Romance; most of the other chief favourites, such as *Ogier le Danois* and the *Quatre Filz Aymon*, had been many years in print by this time, either at Paris or Lyons or both; and lastly, friend Michel le Noir was a publisher who followed rather than led, and almost all his publications were books which had already been successful with other publishers such as Vérard or Trepperel. So much has been lost—so many early books exist only in single copies—that it seems more probable than improbable that there was an editio princeps, now lost, of *Huon de Bordeaux*.

Following these two editions of Le Noir come several without date, which can only be arranged and dated conjecturally, according to the time in which their various publishers are known or supposed to have been in business.

Of these, the first in order is probably that published by the widow of Jehan Trepperel, whose name appears alone in books between 1522 and 1527.¹ I have not seen this edition, of which there is no copy in the British Museum. The title and colophon are given in Brunet, and need not be reproduced here.

The undated editions of Olivier Arnoullet at Lyons and

¹ Harrisse, *Excerpta Columb.* Introd. p. xlviii.

Denys Janot at Paris may be provisionally arranged in this order, as the former published a book as early as 1525,¹ while according to Renouard, Denys Janot is only found at the address given in his *Huon de Bordeaux* after 1532. This latter is not mentioned in Brunet, but there is a copy in the British Museum. The colophon runs as follows :

‘Cy finissent les faictz et gestes du noble Huon de Bordeaux Duc de Guyenne et Per de France. Auecques plusieurs aultres faictz et Prouesses daulcuns princes regnans en son temps. Nouuellement imprime a Paris par Denys Janot demourant en la rue neufue nostre Dame a Lymaige saint Jehan Baptiste pres sainte Geneuiefue des Ardans.’²

The woodcuts are all but one transfer-cuttings from those in the edition of 1513. There appear to be some ten or twelve, including two repeated. But eight pages are missing in the British Museum copy (signatures i and k).

The edition of Jean Bonfons, who published from 1547 to 1568, is almost certainly later than the two last-named. Both on the title-page and in the colophon it is stated that it is ‘Imprime nouuellement pour Jean Bonfons, Libraire demourant en la Rue neuue nostre Dame a lenseigne saint Nicolas’; but no date is given. The book contains nine woodcuts (with repeats, fourteen), old cuts re-used, and without any special merit or interest except that on the title-page. This, however, is a superior cut, representing a king riding in procession under a canopy; it is from the

¹ *Galien Retboré*. Brunet notes that the copy he had seen had lost its colophon, so he gives no date. But Vingtrinier, *Histoire de l'imprimerie à Lyon*, 1894, p. 187, gives the date as above. He mentions also a book published by one or other of the Arnoullets, he does not say which, with an earlier date still: *Les Gestes des Tholosains*, 1517; this book was apparently unknown to Brunet.

² In the British Museum catalogue this book is dated thus 1[565], the figures lxx on the title-page (denoting the number of *cabiers*) having, as often, been taken for the date.

original block, and not from the transfer-cutting which appears in other books. In *Three Hundred Notable Books*,¹ p. 77, a facsimile is given of this cut from Petrarch's *Triumphes*, 1520, its first recorded use apparently. But the fleur-de-lis decoration on the canopy and the general design suggest that the cut was originally used (or intended) to represent some actual occasion; for instance, the coronation or entry into Paris of Francis I, for whom the youthful king on horseback might very well be meant. Of the other cuts, two are poor transfer-cuts of Le Noir's *Huon de Bordeaux* designs mentioned on p. 23 above. We may note that the book contains 264 leaves, but the cuts all occur in the first third of the volume, there being no more illustrations after fol. lxxii.

After these we come to a few editions which bear dates, the first of which is an octavo of 1566 of which Brunet can record nothing except that it is mentioned by Du Verdier. He had not seen the book himself, neither have I.

The quarto published at Lyons by Benoist Rigaud, and dated 1586, has more to say for itself, and is an interesting book. It is well printed in Roman letter, and contains 360 pages numbered in arabic figures, with a final unnumbered leaf on which is nothing but a woodcut. The text of the romance in this edition has been a good deal altered and the sentences often pared down; and now for the first time (to my knowledge) the lengthy romance is divided into two parts or 'books', the division being made where there is no real break, but actually in the middle of a conversation, and in the middle of a chapter, into which a new chapter-heading is inserted.² Although the whole is paged continuously, the second 'book' begins at a second set of signatures, the first being A—Z, the second AA—KK. In fact it looks very much

¹ 'Three Hundred Notable Books added to the Library of the British Museum under the keepership of Richard Garnett, 1899.'

² Cap. 106, though the chapters are not numbered in any of the early editions.

as if the division had been determined in the printing office, and according to the convenience of the printer rather than consideration of the matter.

The book contains forty-five different woodcuts of all sorts and sizes, fifty-three with the repeats. None of these appear to be new nor, with a single exception, p. 297 (misnumbered 299), originally designed for this romance. But their very variety gives them some interest, as they form almost a connected exhibition of Lyons woodcuts from the rude beginnings learned from Basle (p. 253) down through the promising second stage when the Lyons woodcutters had begun a style of their own (pp. 120, 124, 270, &c.) to the later period when the influence of Venetian cuts had swamped this hopeful beginning with mediocre imitations of the Italian style and copies of Venetian designs. Thus on p. 276 there is a reduced copy of one of the three-compartmented cuts to Ovid's *Heroides*, Venice, Tacuino, 1501 (Hero and Leander), and on p. 19 a miniature cut derived (through a previous reduction in Boulle's Lyons edition of 1527) from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Venice, 1497 (Bk. viii, Nisus and Scylla). On the title-page is a cut of a knight on horseback with vizor raised, both horse and man staring fixedly at a shield hung on a tree, which shield bears the monogram of BR, i. e. Benoist Rigaud, the publisher of the book. On the last leaf is the cut of a man on horseback, the horse wearing a plume and half turned to the spectator, which is used or imitated on the title-page of the succeeding small octavo editions of Lyons and Rouen.

There were six of these, three from Lyons and three from Rouen. The Lyons are dated 1606, 1612, 1626; of the Rouen none has a date. I have not seen the edition which appears to have set the style, that of 1606; but there is a copy of the next, 1612, in the British Museum (misdated in the catalogue 1611), and from this it is evident that the Rouen

three imitated closely the Lyons three in 'format', type, and illustrations. In all, the illustrations are few and mostly of second-rate quality. The subjects are so vague and general that it is impossible to say if any of them were designed specially for their present purpose. They fit the page very well. The Rouen editions seem the most common, and occur fairly often, sometimes in one volume and sometimes in two.

The Romance after this seems to have fallen quite out of favour, like the rest of its kin, and there is a long gap, till we come to its revival in the chap-books of Troyes, Lille, and Rouen. The earliest of these that I have seen is that of Troyes with the date 1705; and there were many succeeding. Every one knows these Troyes chap-books, and I need not describe them. But there is one very significant alteration of the text which marks the boundary-line separating the chap-book stage completely from the earlier editions. This is in the later part of the Romance, in one of the additions to the original story called Ide and Olive. The heroine Ide, dressed as a man, has done great deeds of prowess on behalf of the Emperor of Rome, whose daughter Olive of course falls in love with the victorious hero; there follows the discovery of her sex, and she is condemned to be burned. The next chapter-heading runs as follows: 'Comment nostre Sire feist grans miracles pour Yde, car il la fist estre homme, dont l'Empereur et Olive eurent grant joye.' With a great odour of incense an angel arrives and announces this miracle, and all goes merry as a marriage bell. But by the year 1700 the angel as *Deus ex machina* had lost his reality, and the miracle its credibility. In the chap-book version the original female Ide is left to be burned while Olive marries a prince of the same name, 'à fin de ne point corrompre cette histoire.' Could banality descend to a lower depth, or poverty of invention go more naked and unashamed?

Huon de Bordeaux, early editions.

(* Only known through Brunet's account. † Not in Brunet.)

- † 1. Paris, M. le Noir : 26 November 1513 : fol.
- 2. Paris, M. le Noir : 24 December 1516 : fol. (sometimes with Jehan Petit's name instead).
- * 3. Paris, Jehan Trepperel, s.d. : 4to.
- † 4. Paris, Denys Janot, s.d. : 4to.
- * 5. Lyons, Olivier Arnoullet, s.d. : 4to.
- 6. Paris, Jehan Bonfons, s.d. : 4to.
- * 7. Paris (no information), 1566 : 8vo.
- 8. Lyons, Benoist Rigaud, 1586 : 4to.
- * 9. Lyons (no information), 1606 : 8vo.
- 10. Lyons, Pierre Rigaud, 1612 : sm. 8vo.
- † 11. Rouen, Louys Costé, s.d. : sm. 8vo.
- 12. Rouen, Veufue L. Costé, s.d. : sm. 8vo.
- * 13. Lyons, J. Huguetant, 1626 : sm. 8vo.

Chap-book editions.

Troyes, Jacques Oudot, 1705 : 4to.

Do. do. 1707 (priv. 1705) : 4to.

Do. do. (approbation to his widow, 26 May 1723) : 4to.

Do. Veuve Oudot & Jean Oudot fils (permission confirmed July 1725) : 4to.

Do. as the last, but second part dated on title-page 1727.

(There are at least two different settings up of the type in editions with permissions of the same date.)

Troyes, Pierre Garnier, permission 1726 : 4to.

Lille, Veuve Pillot, permission without name of publisher 1726 : 4to.

Rouen, Lecrène-Labbey, s.d. (circa 1800) : 8vo.

MELUSINE

Any bibliography of the Romance of *Melusine* must perforce take account of its literary history, because of the different versions of the different printed editions. These, however, all derive from the lengthy but interesting compilation of Jean d'Arras; and therefore for bibliographical purposes it is not necessary to go behind that, or attempt to analyse the various elements out of which this writer compounded his 'History'. To students of folklore and romance such an analysis presents very great interest, as well as to genealogists occupying themselves in the attempt to disentangle fact from fiction in the history of the House of Lusignan. Some effort at such disentanglement was made as long ago as 1587 by a member of that House¹; but beyond its bibliographical interest the book has little claim to attention. The most recent work dealing with the subject is that of Jules Baudot, *Les Princesses Yolande et les Ducs de Bar . . . première partie, Mélusine*, 8vo, Paris, 1900.

The Romance exists in three different forms; but these are not separate and distinct versions of the story, the second being derived directly from the first, the third directly from the second.

1. *Melusine*: Romance in prose compiled by Jean d'Arras, 1387-93.

a. Exists in several manuscripts, one in the British Museum (Harley 4418).

b. Printed by Steinschaber at Geneva, 1478.

c. Edited from this edition by Ch. Brunet in the *Bibl. Elzév.*, 1854.

d. Englished about 1500. Unique manuscript in British Museum: Royal 18 B, ii.

¹ Les genealogies de soixante et sept très-nobles et très-illustres maisons . . . par R. P. Estienne de Cypre, de la Royale Maison de Lusignan: 4to, Paris, G. Lenoir, 1587.

- e. Edited from this manuscript by A. K. Donald, Early English Text Society, 1895.
- f. English version condensed and modernized in John Ashton's *Romances of Chivalry*, London, 1887.¹
- 2. The *Roman de Parthenay*, or *Roman de Lusignan*, an abridgement and partial rearrangement of Jean d'Arras' Romance in verse by a poet named Coudrette (or Coudrecte).
 - a. Exists in a good many manuscripts, one in the British Museum: Add. 6796.
 - b. Edited by Francisque Michel, Niort, 1854.
 - c. Englished about 1500-1520. Unique manuscript in Trinity College, Cambridge.
 - d. Edited from this manuscript by W. W. Skeat, Early English Text Society, 1866.
- 3. *Melusina*, German prose version rendered from Coudrette's poem.
 - a. Exists in manuscripts. (See Schorbach, *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, i. 138.)
 - b. First printed by Bämmler, Augsburg, 1474 (copy in British Museum, G 19934). Very numerous subsequent editions.
 - c. A fairly close English version from a modern German edition by Mrs. Leighton in *Mediaeval Legends*, London, 1895.

The existence of a second and derivatory form of the romance must be put down to two causes: firstly, to the prolixity of the original compilation, and secondly to the unskilful and ill-balanced plan of it. Jean d'Arras, excellent as he is in description and narrative, shows himself anything but

¹ For bibliographical purposes account must also be taken of 'Geoffroy à la grand dent', a portion of the prose romance of Jean d'Arras, first printed by Olivier Arnoullet, Lyons, 1549. There is a modern French version by Alfred Delvau in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Bleue*, vol. iii, p. 289, as well as a version of Melusine in modern French.

skilful in the construction of a long story, or the management of a drama complicated by many details and side-shows. Possibly, too, he was hampered by instructions from his patron and the necessity of glorifying the House of Lusignan. The result is that the comparatively simple and engrossing story of Melusine is interrupted by an immense interpolation relating at full length the deeds of four of her sons, how they conquered great kingdoms and gained wealthy wives. The Romance, indeed, might be divided into four parts: the first telling the early history of Raymond and Melusine; the second, the feats of the four sons above mentioned; the third, the continuation of the story of Melusine proper; and the last, the adventures of Geoffrey of the Great Tooth.

It is not surprising to find that a later lord of the House of Lusignan commissioned a professional poet to rewrite the Romance; and in the poem of Couldrette the inconveniences and misproportions of the prose romance have been skilfully rectified by an evidently practised hand. The whole has been reduced to about one-third of its original length; the unwieldy interruption has been cut down to a few side episodes that are worked into the general plan of the story without undue distraction; and a judicious rearrangement in a few places has markedly improved the scheme of the story, and given it more cohesion and dramatic development.

But together with the considerable gain in briskness and sustained interest there is also a very perceptible loss in vividness and realistic quality. The original prose romance displays a somewhat remarkable power of graphic description and genuine character-drawing. The incidents of fight and foray suggest strongly that the writer had himself witnessed scenes of the kind; and the 'berserker' character of Geoffrey of the Great Tooth, who always swears 'by the tooth of God', is well sustained and 'convincing' enough for the work of a modern novelist. In the Court poet's smug octosyllabic

couplets most of these qualities disappear or are softened down; and the interest of the story as mere story is brought out and made paramount. If we imagine *Rob Roy* cut down and condensed and retold in pretty drawing-room versification, we have a fairly adequate picture of the difference between the *Melusine* of Jean d'Arras and the *Roman de Parthenay* of Couldrette.

This disquisition on its literary history has been necessary to explain the bibliography of the Romance. The poem of Couldrette itself was not indeed printed in early days; but it was this and not the original romance that was rendered in the German prose version which is the editio princeps of *Melusine*, and which won such popularity for the story in Germany that no fewer than thirty editions were printed in the course of the next hundred and fifty years. Further, it was the early German editions that first illustrated the book with woodcuts; and, as so often happened in the case of romances and other books of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the earliest illustrations set the mode for all succeeding, and these early German woodcuts were copied and imitated not only in the German editions of the German version of *Melusine*, but also in French editions of the French or original version. And in this lies the explanation of a curious fact which must have struck every reader of the French prose romance as reprinted in the *Bibliothèque Elzévirienne* (the only accessible form of the original), namely, the extraordinary difference in length of the chapters as marked by the chapter-headings, some occupying but a page or two, and others extending over twenty, thirty, even sixty pages. The fact is that these apparent chapter-headings were intended not so much for 'arguments' of the sections into which they divide the work as for explanations of the illustrations to which they were attached. The first edition of the French or original text of Jean d'Arras, printed at Geneva, was illustrated with copies

of the cuts in the earlier German edition, and the explanations of these cuts were translated into French and printed with the cuts in places to suit the French version, which as we saw is three times as long as the German. It followed naturally that there are very long passages in the French with no illustration and no picture-title, and therefore (in the unillustrated text) with no 'chapter-heading' or division of any kind. Had the modern text of the *Bibliothèque Elzévirienne* been taken from a manuscript instead of from the Genevan edition, the work would no doubt have shown a better system of divisions. The manuscript in the British Museum has but some six or eight illustrations, but is divided by chapter-headings into one hundred and sixteen chapters (as against sixty-five in the Genevan edition), according to the natural breaks or divisions of the subject-matter.¹

A full account and list of the German editions is easy of access in Schorbach's article in the *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, vol. i, p. 132 (June 1897). And Brunet mentions fourteen French editions, of which four are Incunabula. The first printed edition, containing the earliest series of woodcut illustrations, is by general agreement the German edition printed by Bämmler at Augsburg and bearing the date 1474, of which by great good fortune the British Museum possesses a very fine copy. The cuts in this are of early workmanship and design; but from them all succeeding are derived directly or indirectly. The next set of cuts appears in the German edition without place, date, or name of printer, which Schorbach and other authorities attribute to Bernhard Richel of Basle, and date between 1474 and 1478. Schorbach asserts that these cuts are copied from the illustrations in a manuscript actually existing in the University Library at Basle. I live in hopes some day of testing this assertion for

¹ This manuscript is slightly imperfect at the beginning, and possibly one or two miniatures and chapter-headings are missing.

myself. Comparing these cuts with the Bämle, one would naturally assume that they were improved and enlarged reproductions of the earlier designs; just as the Husz and Le Roy cuts were intended to improve upon the Ortuin in the case of the *Roman de la Rose*. The first French edition is almost certainly later than this; and the cuts in it are copies, sometimes reversed, of its woodcuts. It was published not in France but at Geneva, and is dated 1478. M. Claudin was certainly misled in supposing that the copying was the other way about: he only knew the Richel series from their after appearance in a Lyons edition of the French version, and imagined that they were of French workmanship.

All the early editions of *Melusine* are so extremely rare that it is impossible to find copies of more than one or two in the same library or collection; and hence the comparison and inquiry as to their relation to one another is very difficult. The Netherlands series described in Sir Martin Conway's *Woodcutters of the Netherlands* was first printed in 1491, and may therefore be derived from one or other of these three earlier series; but from mere description it is impossible to say; and all editions containing these cuts appear to be out of reach except at the cost of such journeying as Sir Martin himself undertook for the purpose of his work above mentioned.

Leaving the other sets aside, there are a few particulars with regard to the Richel cuts which I think are of sufficient interest to place before the Bibliographical Society in a connected way. Originating at Basle, as illustrations to the German version, the cuts seem almost immediately to have passed on to Lyons, and reappear in three editions of the French version of *Melusine* printed there. (The relations of the printers and publishers of Basle and Lyons were close in early days.) These three editions are described by M. Claudin in his third volume, all being of the utmost rarity. Of the first, printed by Ortuin and Schenk, only two copies, both

imperfect, are known. The next was issued by Guillaume Le Roy, and of that also only two copies exist, one of which is in the Douce Collection in Bodley's. Of the third, printed by Mathieu Husz, M. Claudin mentions only one copy—that at Chantilly. I have examined both copies of the second of these rare editions—at the Arsenal and at the Bodleian; and I found that the full series of the Richel cuts is reproduced in the book, with the exception of a single cut in the middle, and of the four illustrations at the end which illustrated the four chapters not existing in the French version of the Romance, in which therefore these four cuts had no *raison d'être*.

Besides these three Lyons editions, there is an edition in Spanish in which most of these same cuts appear, together with a few traced-cuttings reversed, replacing the original blocks. A copy of this is in the British Museum. It was printed at Toulouse in 1489; and strange as it seems to find perishable and easily injured wood-blocks wandering to and fro in this manner, it appears pretty certainly to have been issued between the second and third of the three Lyons editions, the last of which M. Claudin places conjecturally about 1494, five years later than the date in the Spanish book. This is confirmed by the appearance in the Lyons edition of a reduced copy of the scene of Riding under the Stars in place of the original cut which was still in place in the Toulouse edition.

In the Toulouse impression of these cuts there is an interesting little specimen of wood-cutting craft noticeable in one of the blocks. The cut is used twice; in the first use the formidable tusk which always marks Geoffrey of the Big Tooth had evidently got broken off the wood-block, and does not appear, nor does the mark like a lion's claw on his brother Anthony's cheek. But when the same cut is used later there is the big tooth again, reinserted by some device of the wood-cutter, though perceptibly different from that which had been broken; and the lion's claw mark also appears again.

From these Richel cuts were copied the several series which illustrate succeeding German editions, such as those published by Knoblochtzer at Strasburg, which are in the British Museum, and the smaller and worse edition of Knobloch, in which the little cuts are almost despicably bad, although this wretched edition was priced at over a hundred pounds in a bookseller's catalogue not long before the war.

In Mr. John Ashton's *Romances of Chivalry* are small reproductions of sixteen of the Richel cuts. Both Muther and Claudin give full-sized facsimiles of some few of them.

As was said above, the chapter-headings in the earliest German editions are really only picture-titles, describing not the contents of the coming chapter but the particular scene in it which the woodcut illustrates. Those in the Richel edition, and their accompanying illustrations, correspond almost exactly to those in the Bämle edition; and the illustrations appear to have been certainly founded upon those in the earlier book, with the ambitious improvements of a more highly developed art. There is a slight difference in the numbers in the two editions, the earlier, Bämle, containing seventy cuts with a few repeats among them, or sixty-three separate cuts. Richel has sixty-seven cuts with no repeats.¹ This difference is partly accounted for by the Richel cutter cutting separate designs for cuts which were repeated in Bämle, which would naturally give the former seven more than its exemplar. But on the other hand Bämle twice gives two cuts to a single picture-title where Richel only has one, and also in two places he has a cut where Richel for some reason has none. Owing to the rearrangement of

¹ All existing copies of the Richel edition appear to be imperfect; but from a comparison of several the above number of cuts has been computed to be what a perfect copy should contain. The numbers given here for the Bämle edition are taken from the excellent copy in the British Museum, but Hain (*11064) mentions a difference in copies.

the story in Couldrette's version, there are in the German printed editions two stories at the end which are not there in the French prose romance—one is the tale of Melior who kept the Castle of the Sparrow-hawk; the other, of Palatine (or Palestine) who guarded the treasure of her father Helmas. The illustrations to these, four in number, are naturally omitted in the French printed editions, although both stories are in fact merely amplifications of what in Jean d'Arras is told, very briefly, in the prefatory part of his romance. See *Melusine*, *Bibl. Elzév.*, p. 24.

It is to be hoped that some day facsimile reproductions may be made of all the three earliest editions of *Melusine*, the German editions of Bämle and Richel, and the French of Steinschaber. The exact relations of one to the other could then be clearly defined.



THE TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY

Held 19 January 1920.

Previous to the Annual Meeting the following Annual Report and Balance Sheet were circulated by means of the Society's *News Sheet*.

ANNUAL REPORT

Like the rest of the world the Bibliographical Society has found the last twelvemonth unusually difficult, and perhaps all that can be claimed in this Annual Report is that it has been successfully kept going. Vol. XIV of our *Transactions* has been issued, the *Bibliography of Landor*, and the second volume of Prof. Carleton Brown's *Register of Middle English Religious Verse* are all in type, and most of the copy for *Transactions*, Vol. XV, has been sent to the printer. Our monthly meetings have been fairly well attended. Twenty-two new British Members have been elected.

All this shows that the Society is thoroughly alive, but it does not seem possible at present to see ahead with sufficient certainty to find a trustworthy financial basis for a new programme of work. Some increase in the annual subscription in the near future seems inevitable, and the Society will be asked to decide as to this at a special meeting, held before one of the ordinary meetings, in the course of the year. Meanwhile it is recommended that the Roll of the Society shall still be kept open in view of possible resignations should the subscription be raised.

The only important change now to be announced is that in order to print the papers read before the Society much

more quickly than has hitherto been possible, our *Transactions* will henceforth be published in quarterly parts, probably in March, June, September, and December, and by way of lessening the cost of this it is proposed to permit copies to be bought by non-members and to accept advertisements. How much extra matter besides the papers read before the Society can be printed will depend on finance, but it is hoped that room will at least be found for a record of the chief bibliographical books published and for reviews. It is hoped, also, that *The Library*, founded by Sir John MacAlister in 1888, which has already enjoyed a longer life than any other British periodical of the kind, may be brought into the scheme, and that the quarterly numbers may be gradually worked up into a full bibliographical magazine.

As a result of the projected quarterly publication of our *Transactions* the Society's *News Sheet*, started by Mr. Pollard at the beginning of his Secretaryship, will shortly cease to appear.

In order that the difference in the prices of our older books and those now being printed may not be too glaring the Council has sanctioned small increases in the charges for the older publications, rising to 50 per cent. in the case of those of which the stock is now much reduced. On the other hand the price of Vols. VII—X of our *Transactions*, of which there are rather more copies in stock than of the later volumes, has been temporarily reduced from 10s. 6d. to 7s. 6d. each, and the Index to Vols. I—X from 6s. to 4s. 6d. It is hoped that members who have joined the Society since these were issued will help our finances by buying them. This lowered price comes into force at once, the increases as soon as the new prices are circulated in the forthcoming reprint of our List of Members. Until that is issued such of our books as are not reserved for sale in sets can be bought at the old prices.

Annual Report

43

BALANCE SHEET

From 1 January to 31 December 1919.

RECEIPTS.			PAYMENTS.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Balance (1 Jan., 1919) +			Printing, Paper, Casing, and		
£100 on Deposit . . .	500	13 5	Distribution . . .	546	3 6
British Entrance Fees . .	22	1 0	Rent . . .	23	2 0
British Subs., 1916-1918 . .	30	9 0	Expenses of Meetings . .	12	4 6
" 1919 . . .	245	14 0	Income Tax . . .	2	0 6
" 1920 . . .	13	13 0	Bank Charges . . .	0	9 7
British Life Member . .	12	12 0	Hon. Treasurer (for Petty		
Interest on Deposit and In-			Cash) . . .	4	0 0
vestments . . .	14	7 11	Secretarial Expenses, 1918 .	2	19 0
Sale of Publications to Mem-			" " 1919 . . .	2	14 6
bers . . .	118	16 11	U.S.A. Hon. Treasurer's Ex-		
United States Entrance Fees			penses (= Subscription) . .	1	1 0
and Subscriptions . . .	191	16 4	Insurance . . .	1	11 9
Foreign Subs., 1919 . . .	6	5 9	Research Work . . .	25	0 0
" 1920 . . .	2	1 1	Expenses for Society's Li-		
			brary . . .	5	8 0
			Cheque returned . . .	1	1 0
			Balance at Bank (31 Dec.,		
			1919) + £100 on Deposit.	530	15 1
	£1,158	10 5		£1,158	10 5

R. F. SHARP, *Hon. Treasurer.*

Examined with vouchers and found correct.

ALEXR. NEALE.

JAMES P. R. LYELL.

3 January 1920.

ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
£300 2½% Consols Bonds @		Estimated liability for 27	
£51 . . .	153 0 0	Life Members . . .	283 10 0
£100 3½% New South Wales		Subscriptions received in ad-	
Bond . . .	88 0 0	vance . . .	13 13 0
£100 5% Exchequer Bond . .	98 0 0	Estimated cost of completing	
Estimated value of Stock of		and sending out books for	
Publications . . .	800 0 0	the year and other printing	500 0 0
Balance of Account for 1919	530 15 1		
Subscriptions in arrear, about	3 3 0		

ANNUAL MEETING

The Society held its Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting at 4.45 p.m. on Monday, 19 January 1920, under the shadow of a great loss, Sir William Osler, its President for seven years, who had done more than any other man to keep it alive during the War, having died, after the Annual Report was in the hands of members, on 29 December 1919.

In the absence of a President Sir Frederic Kenyon, V.P., Director of the British Museum, was called to the Chair, and conducted the business of the first part of the Annual Meeting.

The minutes of the previous Annual Meeting were read and confirmed.

The Annual Report and Balance Sheet were taken as read, and after remarks on the Balance Sheet by Mr. R. F. Sharp and on the Report by Mr. Redgrave, their adoption was moved from the chair and carried unanimously.

A vote of thanks to Mr. A. W. Pollard for his work on the *News Sheet* during the last 26 years was proposed from the chair and carried by acclamation.

Mr. P. S. Allen proposed the re-election of the Officers and Council of the Society, Dr. Henry Thomas taking the place of Mr. Charles Sayle as a Member of Council. This was seconded by Mr. Bourdillon and carried.

Sir Frederic Kenyon proposed the election of Mr. Falconer Madan as President of the Society. This was carried by acclamation.

Mr. Falconer Madan, having taken the chair, proposed the following resolution :

‘That this Society records its gratitude for the conspicuous services rendered by its late President, Sir William Osler, during his seven years’ tenure of office, and its deep sense of the loss occasioned by his death alike to Medicine, Literature, and Bibliography.’

In proposing this resolution Mr. Madan said : Sir William Osler's many friends had indulged in the hope that after his 70th birthday, so finely celebrated in London on 11 July 1919, he would have gradually put aside, not his aims or his energy, but what may be termed the decorative part of his honours and work, and would have given some ten, or even twenty years of vigorous life and mellow wisdom to subjects in which his abiding interests lay. As he himself said, on the occasion referred to, the love of his life had been given equally to books and men, and in both he would have delighted to the end. But it was not to be.

Of his eminence in his own profession, of his powers of mind and memory, his faculty of organizing and his unmeasured friendliness and sympathy, much has been written since his death : but of his passion for the history and literature of Medicine, for old and interesting books in general, and for the bibliography of them, hardly enough. Few notices of him have even mentioned that he was the President of this Society for the last seven years, and took an active part in its proceedings and in safeguarding its interests and life during the troublous times of the War.

To the Bodleian he was a firm and constant friend : the Library was his admiration and delight, and as a Curator and a member of the Standing Committee he had considerable influence on its administration. He promoted the establishment of the room for students of music, as well as the Science Research Room at the Camera, and when a good opportunity for a special purchase presented itself he was among the first to offer liberal support and to engage the interest of friends. Perhaps no part of the Library appealed more to his feelings than the wonderful collection of books, grave and gay, massive and light, out-of-the-way and trivial, which came to the Bodleian under the will of Robert Burton, the author of the immortal *Anatomy of Melancholy*. That collection

contains the sources of a work which more than any other combined Sir William's chief interests—humanity, literature, and medicine. It cannot be doubted that had he been spared for a further period of leisure and activity, he would have carried out a scheme which was near to his heart and of which he often used to talk to the present speaker—the preparation of a final edition of that great Oxford work, based on a collation of the early editions (to be undertaken by a committee of friends), and furnished with annotations by the master's hand.

But it is impossible to close even these few words without dwelling for a moment on the larger features of Osler's life. His experience led him to the view that a man is sane morally at 30, rich mentally at 40, wise spiritually at 50, if ever; and that his really effective work is done between the ages of 25 and 40. Among his avowed principles three at least were prominent, and in their simplest form were these: to do the day's work well, not caring overmuch for the morrow; to obey the golden rule, 'do as you would be done by', towards friends and patients; and to acquire equanimity alike in success and sorrow. If he came to you as a friend, he had a way of drawing up his chair to yours, as though all his time were at your disposal, with looks and words of infinite compassion, if you were in ill case, of helpful encouragement if you were striving against hindrances, and sympathetic comprehension if you were in doubt and difficulty. These qualities are akin to the divine. Sir William's friends all over the world feel his loss with personal pain and imperishable regret, not only from his great and varied gifts of mind and intellect, but more than all because those gifts were combined with real human kindness of heart, and because his whole life was devoted to the welfare and betterment of his fellow men.

The motion was seconded by Sir d'Arcy Power, who bore testimony to the wonderful versatility of Sir W. Osler's mind, and supported by Mr. P. S. Allen, who said that hardly

a week passed during Sir William's residence in Oxford without his spending some hours in the Bodleian Library; and not only there was his love of his books shown, but also at Corpus, at Merton, and at Ewelme. His interest never seemed to cease in any matter where books were concerned. His own library was collected, not as a series of treasures by reason of their rarity or obvious arts, but because he regarded them as instruments for the advancement of knowledge.

The motion was carried, the members rising silently in their places to signify their assent.

The Annual Meeting was then closed.

MR. WINSHIP'S ANNUAL LETTER ON BIBLIOGRAPHICAL WORK
IN THE UNITED STATES

The important bibliographical event of the year in the United States is the appearance of the 'Check List of English Literature before 1640' in Mr. Henry E. Huntington's library. It is issued in unpretentious form, as befits an incidental preliminary to a catalogue which is already well in hand, and which hopes to improve upon that of the E. D. Church library, which is to be embodied in it. The Huntington Check List is none the less a model, better than any other of equal extent, of how to list the possessions of a library. The titles are abbreviated, but not beyond the point of ready identification nor of sufficient suggestion of contents. The summary collations give exactly what, and all, any one needs in order to test the completeness of another copy. Where the compilers are aware of variations in copies that might be supposed to be identical, the precise word or page that needs to be examined is succinctly and specifically set forth.

'A Thackeray Library' is a catalogue of a private collection prepared by the owner, Mr. H. S. Van Duzer, with such intelligence and thoroughness that it is assured permanent

48 *Bibliographical Work in the United States in 1919*

value as a bibliography. It has most of the technical faults that one expects in titles of books put together by the non-professional collector with the aid of his book-selling friends and without that of competent proof readers. The fact that these faults are so common is the best evidence that scarcely any one ever notices such details as inconsistency in alphabetizing or in the arrangement of title-entries and collations, and that consequently these things do not greatly matter. They ordinarily mean that the printing bill was larger than it need have been, but so long as the payer does not object, the user need not. Mr. Van Duzer has made his catalogue a real bibliography by including, without typographical distinction, all of the very few titles that he has failed to secure as yet, and by stating in the notes whatever he knows about the publication of each work.

Two catalogues have appeared during the year that have been awaited with keen anticipations, that of the Harry Elkins Widener Collection and Part I of Volume I of the John Carter Brown Library. The Widener books, about 3,500 volumes, are described in five volumes. Two of these contain in alphabetical order the headings, which are not always the author's name, omitting Cruikshank, Dickens, and Stevenson, each of whom has a separate volume. The plan of the catalogue was determined by Mr. Widener in the *Catalogue of some of the more important Books, Manuscripts, and Drawings* in his possession, which he prepared himself and issued in 1910, three years after he graduated from college. It is a model of devoted diligence and painstaking accuracy. In accordance with this standard the completed catalogue gives for such entries as the folio editions of Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson, and Shakespeare, the number of the page on which each play begins and ends. It describes with approximate consistency each of the other title entries, which vary in character from the works of 'Lewis Carroll' and Kate

Greenaway to those of Charles Mathews and Rowlandson. For these as well as for most of the better known English and American authors, this catalogue gives a considerable amount of detail not ordinarily included in similar works.

The Stevenson volume of the Widener Catalogue was distributed in 1913, and has won its place through the importance of the collection and the care with which the books are described. The Dickens volume does not approach this in completeness, but compensates for its shortcomings in part by printing the text of a series of contracts between Dickens and Chapman & Hall, which give the collection some of its distinction. These relate to *Pickwick Papers* and *Nicholas Nickleby*, dated 18 November 1837, *Sketches by Boz* and *Master Humphrey's Clock*, 31 March 1840, *Oliver Twist*, 2 July 1840, and *Martin Chuzzlewit*, 7 September 1841. The Cruikshank volume of 279 pages describes 3,050 separate items, imprints, plates, drawings, and autographs, by, ascribed to, or associated with the men of that family. A plate signed 'Mary Cruikshank' came to light after the catalogue was printed. In nearly every instance the provenance of the item is given, and as most of these came from the Douglass, Galloway, Truman, and Bement collections, and many of them have George Cruikshank's notations on them, students of his work are likely to rely upon this catalogue for their conclusions. This volume has an index.

The John Carter Brown Library *Bibliotheca Americana* is printed with the perfection of typographic detail which characterizes everything that bears the imprint of Mr. Updike's Merrymount Press. The titles in this Part are given in full, with line endings, but a reference to Pollard (the British Museum Catalogue of Fifteenth Century Books), Brunet, and other authorities usually takes the place of a collation, and bibliographical and explanatory notes are omitted. The catalogue, however, is made more complete than its predecessor by

50 *Bibliographical Work in the United States in 1919*

listing briefly the illuminated manuscripts, early printed books, Aldines, facsimiles, and reprints belonging to the library.

The English members of the Society may be interested in, and perhaps can supplement, two studies that are tucked away in the publications of American local societies. One is an account of Gregory Dexter, master printer and companion of Roger Williams, whose career is described by the librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society in its *Collections* for October 1919, with a list of 70 titles with which he had to do between 1641 and 1644. The other, by Alfred C. Potter of the Harvard Library, in the *Publications* of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts for March of this year, is an attempt to identify the 250 entries in the original list of the books left by John Harvard, which formed the nucleus from which the University library has grown. Forty of these defy him, although there must be some one who can see through *Chareus in Epist.* or *Household Phys.* of 1636. Harvard owned about 400 volumes, representing 329 titles. All but one of these books were burned with the rest of the college library in 1764, but Mr. Potter has succeeded in restoring, either in the identical edition or in one that John Harvard might have owned, over sixty per cent. of the titles identified.

Interest in books about the theatre has been stimulated by 'A Catalogue of the Allen A. Brown Collection of Books relating to the Stage in the Public Library of the City of Boston' and by 'The Development of Scenic Art and Stage Machinery, A List of References in the New York Public Library'. The New York list, of more than 2,471 entries, appeared in the library's *Monthly Bulletin*, and is arranged under 21 headings with author and subject indices. The Boston Catalogue occupies 952 pages with a dozen to twenty entries on a page. It will interest professional librarians as an illustration of the extent to which a large American library carries the practice of cross references, the titles

checked appearing, on an average, rather more than three times each. With these two should be mentioned the Sale Catalogue of books from the library of Evert J. Wendell, in six parts, 27 sessions, 8,212 numbers with a large proportion of bundles, because Mr. Wendell, who has been known as a most omnivorous collector of theatrical material, left his books to Harvard, and those offered at auction were such as the Harvard library presumably already possessed.

The University of Michigan General Library, which begins the New Year in its new building, inaugurates a series of 'Publications' with a catalogue of its Carlyle Collection, the gift of an enthusiastic collector who ranged the outskirts of his subject. Transylvania College in Kentucky has issued a list of its 171 'Rare and Curious Old Works on Medicine, Law, and the Humanities printed before 1700', most of which were apparently picked up, perhaps at attractive prices, by members of the college faculty travelling in Europe somewhat less than a hundred years ago. There are three English imprints before 1640, but no fifteenth century dates.

Robert E. Cowan of San Francisco has printed a 'Bibliography of the Spanish Press of California, 1833-1845', which would be wholly praiseworthy if it contained facsimiles. Fray Alonso de Benavides, who wrote on the natives of New Mexico in 1630, is the subject of a very workmanlike contribution by F. W. Hodge, the development of which is suggestive. This bibliography is No. 1 of Vol. III of the *Indian Notes and Monographs* issued by the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation. It is expanded from material put together in a volume printed privately at Chicago in 1916, which in turn was made up from a preliminary publication in *Land of Sunshine*, Los Angeles, California, 1900. The important new material in the present issue is from a contribution which appeared in the *Catholic Historical Review*, Washington, 1917.

G. P. WINSHIP.

REVIEWS

THE HAEBLER FESTGABE¹

THE war has delayed the publication of this bibliographical tribute to Dr. Haebler for more than two years after the event which it was intended to celebrate, but it has certainly suffered remarkably little in other respects from the adverse conditions under which it was produced. Paper and print are excellent, and it contains 43 plates and illustrations, including a portrait of the recipient. Apart from a bibliography of the latter's works, containing 228 items, it comprises nine essays by various hands. Seven of the authors are Dr. Haebler's own countrymen, the other two being Dr. Collijn, of the Stockholm Royal Library, and the Dutch incunabulist, Father Bonaventura Kruitwagen, but if it had not been for the unhappy events of the last five years this ratio would doubtless have been considerably modified, for it need hardly be said that Dr. Haebler's work stands in high and well-deserved repute wherever incunabula are studied.

The essays vary greatly in length and in general interest. Dr. Collijn, on a device used by Ghotan and others at Lübeck, Dr. Crous, on the incunabula of Münster i. W., and Dr. Schwenke, the head of the Berlin Library, on certain early German bookbinders' stamps, have written purely for the specialist. A somewhat wider appeal is made by Dr. Voulliéme's description of a number of early printed booksellers' lists and university lecturers' announcements, the most remarkable of which is a very handsome sheet in a type used by Jenson and extolling his workmanship, but apparently

¹ *Wiegendrucke und Handschriften*. Festgabe Konrad Haebler zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht, &c., pp. 206. Hiersemann, Leipzig, 1919.

printed after his death by Herbolt, his successor in the firm. Dr. Adolf Schmidt and Dr. Emil Jacobs have added to our knowledge of the practices of two apparently not over-scrupulous eighteenth-century bookmen, one of them German (Baron Hüpsch), the other French (Dom Maugérard). By way of contrast Dr. Freys introduces us to the entirely blameless figure of Johann Baptist Bernhart (1759-1821), who has claims to be regarded as the pioneer of the study of early typography and the first known predecessor of Proctor and Dr. Haebler. As 'scriptor' at the great Munich Library Bernhart had unique opportunities of acquainting himself with the types of the early German printers, and for many years he superintended the selection of books for Munich from the libraries of the secularized Bavarian monasteries, while during the stress of Napoleon's invasions it fell to him to arrange for the removal and safe custody of the principal treasures of the Library—a branch of librarianship which recently experienced a widespread and regrettable revival. His *Gesammelte Schriften*, as he punningly called them, consist partly of tracings of complete alphabets of types employed by nineteen early printers, with numbers under each printer, partly of a series of tracings of various forms of M and other letters, each form numbered and referred to the printer who used it in almost exactly the same way as in Dr. Haebler's *Typenrepertorium*. Bernhart's tracings, as here shown in facsimile, are admirably clear and exact, but cannot of course compete in accuracy with the photographic reproductions of to-day, and the task which he had set himself was in any case far beyond the powers of one man. Still, his effort deserves to be remembered. It would be interesting to know, by the way, who wrote the MS. note on the types in the Ulm incunabulum IA. 9375 (B.M. Cat. ii, p. 537). The handwriting does not appear to be Bernhart's, though it is of his period.

Father Kruitwagen's essay professes to deal only with

a single book, the *Antidotarium animae* of Servas Sanctus, a thirteenth-century Franciscan, but he really covers more ground than any of his collaborators. He has, in fact, taken up once again his favourite plea that the investigation of early printed editions, to be adequate, cannot stop at the purely typographical detail, but must make sure of the exact contents of the books as well. This sounds like a truism, but there is no doubt at all that the technical make-up of incunabula is in a far more advanced state of disentanglement than their literary make-up, and that the cataloguer is liable to have all sorts of surprises sprung upon him in consequence. Father Kruitwagen cites from Meijuffrouw Kronenberg's excellent Catalogue of the Incunabula in the Deventer Athenaeum, which has made a special feature of such inquiries, the discovery that one and the same collection of scriptural examples, as arranged either alphabetically or by subjects, occurs in Hain under no less than four different titles, twice anonymously and twice as a work of S. Bonaventura, whereas its real author, one Nicolaus de Hanapis, is never mentioned at all.¹ While in this case four books reduce themselves to one, Father Kruitwagen, in the main part of his essay, demonstrates conversely that of three supposed editions of Saliceto's *Antidotarium* enumerated in Campbell's *Annales* (Nos. 1495, 1496, 1498) the first is really a totally different work, the author of which was the Servas Sanctus already mentioned. It is true that he has reached this happy result only by the expenditure of an amount of time and labour which the scheme of no large-scale catalogue could afford to a single book, but even a brief and unassuming contents-paragraph may often be a considerable help and should be more freely employed. Father Kruitwagen's counsel of perfection is that descriptions ought to include the first and last few words of the text itself in all cases.

¹ Hain nos. 3535, 3501-3, 6280-1, 6762-6.

Although in a sense it is the most highly specialized piece of work in the book, more than a simple mention is due to the long and fully illustrated monograph of Dr. Hermann Degering on the typography of the first (anonymous) edition of Vitruvius, *De architectura*, hitherto always ascribed to the press of Eucharius Silber at Rome and so catalogued in the British Museum Incunabula Catalogue, vol. iv, p. 124, IB. 19225. This is one of forty or so books, mostly small, printed with a rather heavy roman type of 111-14 mm. to the 20 lines, which came in about the year 1483 and occurs in signed work of Silber and Herolt at Rome and of Matthias Moravus at Naples. Of those not evidently Neapolitan, however, only about half a dozen are completely dated, and not quite so many signed, so that there remains a large number of tracts *sine nota*, all very much alike as to type but known to contain some fairly obvious variations in detail and suspected of concealing a good many more. The Museum Catalogue contented itself with classing nearly all these books with the work of Silber and pointing out some of the variants, without dogmatizing on the authenticity of the ascriptions. Dr. Degering has undertaken the formidable task of sorting them out systematically, with the result that he has distinguished among them four states of a type of ca. 112 mm. and three of a type of ca. 114 mm., the last two of which he assigns not to Silber at all but to a new 'Printer of Vitruvius', so called from his most important book, the edition of the *De architectura* which formed the starting-point of the examination. The present reviewer has had no leisure to check these conclusions, and in any case the minutiae on which they depend cannot be discussed here, but the fullest acknowledgement is certainly due to Dr. Degering's uncommon industry and patience. As to the Vitruvius itself, all the evidence appears to point to its having been printed about 1487 or a little later, certainly not after 1490,

and Dr. Degering has also made the interesting discovery, in a copy at Leipzig, of a variant setting up of the four preliminary leaves. This setting up is in the same type as the body of the book, *plus* a number of wrong-fount (gothic) D's, the frequent repetition of the word 'De' in the list of chapters having exhausted the printer's stock of the proper sort. For the more common setting up, however, not this type but Silber's type 114 (as classified by Dr. Degering) was employed and the greater regularity of its type-page shows clearly that this is the later of the two. The reasons assigned by the author to account for the existence of the two versions are scarcely convincing, and the simplest supposition is surely that an accident happened to the stock as first printed off, necessitating a reprint, while the fact that this reprint is in a type classified as Silber's by Dr. Degering himself suggests that Silber's connexion with the 'Printer of Vitruvius' was really a much closer one than he is willing to admit. Indeed, when we consider how similar the books of all the various groups are in general appearance, and how closely the type-page measurements correspond between them, we cannot help concluding that if they were produced by several printing offices, those offices were at any rate under the same control.

VICTOR SCHOLDERER.

THE INCUNABULA OF AN AUSTRIAN MONASTIC LIBRARY

SCHLÄGL is a little village in Upper Austria of some 200-300 inhabitants, of such small importance that it is only marked on a few large-scale maps. It is almost at the extreme northern point of Upper Austria, where Bavaria meets Bohemia, and is near the terminus of a railway leading north from Linz through Urfahr to Aigen.

It is said to contain a collection of pictures; but we are concerned at present with the early printed books preserved

there in a Premonstratensian Canonry; these are now made accessible to us in a useful little catalogue¹ drawn up by the Librarian, Dom Gerlach Indra. It was published (at Linz) in 1918 to celebrate the seventh centenary of the foundation of the Canonry; and it would seem to owe its inception to the bibliographical enterprise of Dom Norbert Schachinger, to whom we owe our knowledge of the incunabula treasures of the Abbey of Melk.

The Canonry possesses nearly 200 books printed before 1501, and almost the same number 1501-20. Dom Indra has given two lists of these, the first of them as near as may be in chronological order, the second (with shorter titles) under their authors. He has used Hain and Copinger, and the catalogues of a few other libraries, mostly monastic; he has not given any references to Proctor's *Index*, and there is no attempt to arrange the books in their 'natural history' order.

The collection is rich in Strasburg books, which make a fine start with nine specimens of Mentelin's press. Augsburg, too, is very well represented, and from Nuremberg there are no less than five specimens of the work of the 'Fratres ordinis heremitarum', which are by no means commonly to be found. From Passau there are but three books (more might have been expected, owing to its comparative nearness to Schlägl), and the other Germanic town with any considerable number of the volumes to its credit is Basle. From Italy there are ordinary Venetian books, from France and the Low Countries almost nothing; and the collection closes with a rarity in the shape of a production (Hain 2013) from the press of J. Alakraw at Winterberg.

A few points of interest arise from some of the descriptions.

¹ *Catalogus Incunabulorum Plagensium*. Edidit . . . Gerlacus Indra, Bibliothecarius et Custos Canoniae Plagensis (Schlägl). Lincii MDCCCXVIII. Prostat in libraria Ebenhoechiana.

No. 26 (Hain 7352). Did we realize that the full name of Joannes de Frankfordia was Joannes Legenator de Dyppurg?

No. 49 (Hain 7346). It is stated that on Dr. Haebler's authority this was printed by Conrad Winters of Homborch, at Cologne; there is no mention of it in Dr. Voulliéme's book on the Cologne Press.

No. 130 (Biblia latina cum apparatu). As the colophon apparently states that it was printed by Joh. Petri and J. Froben in 1493, their partnership must be put back a year from the date given by Proctor.

No. 152 (Proctor 561). The date is made 'not after 1492' by a buyer's inscription.

No. 153 (Proctor 557). The *Obiectiones in dicta Thalmut*, a book often printed in the fifteenth century, is said to have been written by one Fr. Theobaldus, Sub-prior of the Dominicans at Paris.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

OLD ENGLISH POETICAL ARCHETYPES¹

IN the extant manuscript of *Beowulf* the poem is divided into numbered sections of very unequal length which bear no relation to the subject matter and, indeed, sometimes begin in the middle of a sentence. Dr. Bradley has very plausibly conjectured (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s. v.) that they correspond to the rough sheets of the archetypal manuscript, and in the present paper he seeks to confirm his view by an investigation of the other Old English poems showing numbered sections. The most helpful as regards a general theory of the subject prove to be the *Genesis* and *Exodus* poems of the Junius Manuscript and *Elene* in the Codex Vercellensis. The bibliographical analysis needed by the

¹ The Numbered Sections in Old English Poetical MSS., by Henry Bradley. (A paper read before the British Academy, Nov. 24, 1915, reprinted from the Proceedings, Vol. VII.) London, Humphrey Milford, n.d. (8vo, 23 pages).

'Cædmon paraphrase is exceedingly intricate, and Dr. Bradley's brilliant handling throws a great deal of light on the structure of these perplexing pieces. When the mutilations of the existing manuscript, present and past transpositions, suspected lacunae and possible insertions have been allowed for, there emerges a very strong case for supposing that the manuscript from which the poems are ultimately derived consisted of a number of loose sheets, ending in every case both with a complete verse and a complete sentence (not a usual coincidence in Old English poetry), and each consisting of four pages of writing (probably sometimes stichic and sometimes continuous). At least, the postulated exceptions to either rule are rare if not insignificant. As regards Cynewulf's *Elene*, there are good reasons for supposing that the numbered sections are of precisely similar origin, except for the notable difference that they also correspond to logical divisions of the poem.

There can, I think, be little question that Dr. Bradley is correct in regarding the numbered sections as equivalent to the sheets of an archetypal manuscript: the weak point of the theory appears to lie in the absence of any reason why the *Genesis-Exodus* sheets should have been made to end with a verse and a period, or why *Elene* should have been composed in sections of uniform length.

Now in the latter case it is quite evident that the sections are due to the author himself, who has divided his work structurally into a number of parts, and yet these parts are apparently *also* arbitrarily determined by the sheets of the original manuscript. In spite of Dr. Bradley's remarks on the very governable Pegasus of Old English religious poets, which are undeniably true, the suggestion that Cynewulf allowed the length of his cantos to be dictated by the size of the sheets of parchment he happened to be using appears to me, I confess, rather futile. Surely it is far more likely that the

poem was specially written for reading at a series of uniform sittings, say during meals, and that each canto was written on a separate four-page sheet for convenience of carrying. Such an hypothesis will account for the facts in the case of *Elene*, but how about the 'Cædmon' poems? Here the divisions are not structural, but they are nevertheless metrical. The former fact forbids our supposing that the paraphrase was originally written for periodic reading: yet the latter again, to my mind, makes it improbable that the divisions are what I should call purely archetypal, for I find it very hard to believe that the most mechanical of poets would close a verse and a period together merely because he had come to the end of the sheet he was writing. There must have been some ground more relative than this, and I suggest that here we have an originally undivided work subsequently arranged in cantos on the same lines and for the same purpose as *Elene*. Dr. Bradley maintains that the manuscript in which the numeration arose must have been autograph, arguing very plausibly that to imagine a copyist altering the text so as to make the verse, period, and sheet coincide would be absurd. But I imagine he will admit that the absurdity disappears if we suppose an adequate motive for the alteration. I am aware that the hypothesis advanced is not without difficulties, and that it may necessitate some re-interpretation of the evidence, but it has perhaps sufficient antecedent plausibility to merit consideration.

I append a few notes on particular bibliographical points.

Page 8, diagram. Instead of assuming an original inversion of the second sheet (*b*, *e*), I should suspect that in the course of reparation *b* and *c* were fastened together so as to form a single sheet and this sheet inverted. It is true that Dr. Bradley says (page 12, note 2) that 'the introversion of the middle sheet of a written quire would be a very unlikely accident', but I cannot myself regard it as more improbable than the

inversion of the second sheet (both are quite possible), while such a derangement would be far more likely to happen in the course of repairs than in the original sewing.

Page 8, table. The first line is misleading and likely to cause confusion owing to 'Section II' being written when only the latter portion of it is in question.

Page 9, line 20: 'sheet X happened to be lying inside out, so that the number was placed on the second page.' No, if the sheet had been lying inside out the numeral would have been placed on the third page (cf. page 10, line 28), and we should have had a discrepancy of 35, not of 17, verses. To secure the required result the sheet must have been lying not only inside out but backside foremost; a most unlikely supposition. Dr. Bradley's doubt as to the 'X' being intended for a numeral is confirmed.

Page 12, line 21. Professor Napier's and Dr. Bradley's explanations of the *Exodus* transposition alike necessitate our supposing that certain page divisions of the earlier codex coincided with verse divisions. Since there is no evidence that Old English codices were ever written stichically this seems a serious objection. Waiving this, it appears to me much less unlikely that the middle sheet of a quire should be accidentally inverted (Napier), than that a single leaf which had once been correctly inserted should be replaced the wrong way round (Bradley).

W. W. GREG.

RIVINGTONS¹

MR. SEPTIMUS RIVINGTON has done well in bringing out an enlarged and revised edition of *The Publishing House of Rivingtons*, which he compiled and published in 1894, soon

¹ *The Publishing Family of Rivingtons*. By Septimus Rivington, M.A. Rivingtons, London, 1919, pp. xv, 182.

after he gained the right to use his family name in his new business. He had dissolved partnership with his brother Francis in May 1889 and a year later the original business had been sold to Longmans, after an unbroken existence of 179 years, to which may be added nearly another half-century of pre-existence in the hands of Chiswell. In its earlier form Mr. Rivington's book has been a quarry from which writers on bookselling and publishing have drawn freely, and in this enlarged edition it will be indispensable to all students of the English book-trade since the days of the first Copyright Act, with which the purchase of Chiswell's business by Charles Rivington was nearly contemporaneous. Here may be found records of transactions with Prior and Pope, and of the mysteries of the bookselling association known as the Conger, an autobiographical letter from Smollett, notes on Johnson's Dictionary and Shakespeare, and the story of the *British Critic* from its foundation in 1793, with Beloe and Nares as its editors, to its dissolution fifty years later in consequence of troubles brought on the firm by its Tractarian editors.

Besides the literary and bibliographical interest of Mr. Septimus Rivington's book it would be worth reading if only for the diversity of character in the successive heads of the firm. One member of it broke away to New York, where he edited a newspaper and only escaped a horsewhipping by the adroitness with which he persuaded an angry visitor to try his Madeira. But the brother of this James, John Rivington (1720-92) who went twice a day to service at St. Paul's, equipped with gold-headed cane and a nosegay, was much more typical. Midway between them we may place a Charles Rivington (1754-1831) who went to theatres and dances, and at least one race, and as a member of the 'Military Association' steadfastly attended the executions of Gordon rioters, though his comrades, who at first numbered two hundred,

fell off first to a hundred and then to fifty. It seems difficult to believe that this energetic young volunteer, born 166 years ago, was the grandfather of the Septimus Rivington to whom we owe the present book. But, as the author himself notes, the family has been at once long-lived and prolific.

A. W. P.

NOTES

THE Third Series of *The Library* was brought to a close without any valedictory address from Sir John MacAlister, whose courage in the face of difficulties had kept it alive for thirty years, a much longer term than any other bibliographical magazine has attained in England. Perhaps it will be well to let the Fourth Series begin as quietly as its predecessor ended. It may be explained, however, that it is proposed to give precedence in each number to the papers recently read before the Bibliographical Society, and to use such space as remains for reviews and miscellaneous articles. Under present conditions it is impossible to continue one feature of *The Library*, the excellent articles by Miss Elizabeth Lee on 'recent foreign literature'; but it is hoped that the bibliographical contributors to the last two series will continue to write for the magazine in its new form, and that new features of interest may gradually be developed.

One of the most interesting articles in our last volume was the quaintly named 'The Extra Gill and the Full Quart Pot' in which Mr. G. W. Cole enumerated some of the means by which nine extra lines were inserted into two pages of thirty-seven lines each in a pamphlet entitled: 'A True Coppie of a Discourse written by a Gentleman, employed in the late Voyage of Spaine and Portingale,' 1589. Two correspondents have written to point out that in addition

to the other devices mentioned by Mr. Cole the lines in the reprint were lengthened by one-eighteenth, thus accounting for four of the added nine. Two others, as Mr. Cole noted, were gained by adding to the height of the pages, and a little over three by contractions and shorter spellings, the devices which are denied to modern printers.

The Library offers its congratulations to *The Bodleian Quarterly Record* on completing its second volume and sixth year. The *B.Q.R.* (like this magazine) has not been run for profit, and it was Sir William Osler who wiped off adverse balances. If any member of the Bibliographical Society who does not already take the *Record* wishes to honour our late President's memory at a small expense he should send Bodley's Librarian 14s. for a three years' subscription, post free, and will profit greatly by the transaction.

A. W. P.